

## REMARKS

In the final Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 6-16, 19-22, and 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Goldman et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,051,351) ("Goldman") in view of Aras et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,872,588) ("Aras"), and further in view of Yuen et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,995,092) ("Yuen"); rejected claims 2, 5, and 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Goldman, Aras, and Yuen, in view of Khoo et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,434,747) ("Khoo"); rejected claim 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Goldman, Aras, and Yuen, in view of Herz et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,754,939) ("Herz"); and rejected claims 23 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Goldman, Aras, and Yuen, in view of Campbell et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,536,791) ("Campbell").

Claims 1, 2, and 5-25 are currently pending, with claims 1, 6, 7, 8, 16, and 17 being independent claims. Claims 1, 6, 7, 8, 16, and 17 are hereby amended.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 1, 6-16, 19-22, and 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Goldman in view of Aras and further in view of Yuen.

Claim 1 recites, for example, "[a]n information processing apparatus for delivering contents data via a network to another apparatus, wherein the contents data includes video contents data" comprising, *inter alia*:

"second registration means for registering individual additional information of said contents data on the basis of at least said contents data,

wherein said individual additional information comprises overall individual additional information which is associated with the video contents data as a whole, segment individual additional information which

is different from said overall individual additional information and is associated with one of a plurality of segments of the video contents data, and scene individual additional information which is different from said overall individual additional information and is different from said segment individual additional information and is associated with one of a plurality of scenes in the one of the plurality of segments of the video contents data . . . [and]

transmission means for transmitting said contents data and said individual data via said network to said other apparatus, to enable said video contents data, said general additional information and said individual additional information to be simultaneously displayed on a display screen at said other apparatus . . . .”

None of Goldman, Aras, or Yuen, either alone or in combination, disclose or render obvious the claimed second registration means and transmission means.

Goldman discloses a system for inserting advertisements into an information document displayed to a user, wherein the selection is based at least in part on television programming viewed by the user. See Goldman, Abstract. More specifically, Goldman discloses a system for displaying television programming and separately viewing information documents (such as Web pages or HTML documents), wherein the system monitors the television programs viewed by the user and selects advertisements to insert into the web pages based on the television programs viewed. See, e.g., Goldman, col. 6, ll. 2 11; col. 7, ll. 56-60; col. 8, ll. 37-61; col. 9, ll. 40-45.

As such, Goldman fails to disclose “video contents data” and “individual additional information [that] comprises overall individual additional information which is associated with the video contents data as a whole, segment individual additional information which is different from said overall individual additional information and is associated with one of a plurality of segments of the video contents data, and scene individual additional information which is different from said overall individual additional information and is different from said segment individual additional information and is

associated with one of a plurality of scenes in the one of the plurality of segments of the video contents data,” and enabling “said video contents data . . . and said individual additional information to be simultaneously displayed on a display screen,”

In fact, Goldman teaches away from displaying video contents data simultaneously with overall individual information associated with the video contents data, segment individual additional information associated with a segment of the video contents data, and scene individual additional information associated with a scene of the segment of the video contents data, because Goldman discloses adding advertisement information to a “document” such as a web page. The documents disclosed by Goldman are not video contents data and do not include segments or scenes, as claimed. Therefore, it would make no sense to display segment information and scene information for video content data along with the document disclosed by Goldman.

Yuen discloses a television subscription service, wherein certain information may be included in a television signal, such that a television program may be viewed along with a television program guide. See, e.g., Yuen, Abstract; col. 3, ll. 36-39; col. 10, ll. 3-57. Yuen does not disclose or suggest displaying or transmitting video content data along with overall information, segment information, and scene information for the video content data.

Aras discloses a method of content-coding audio video streams according to audio video stream identifiers and identifiers of portions of the audio video stream, and further discloses collecting viewing behavior information based on the identifiers. See, e.g., Aras, cols. 7-11. For reasons similar to those described above, it would not have

been obvious to transmit and enable simultaneous display of the audio video identification information disclosed by Aras for the documents disclosed by Goldman, because the documents disclosed by Goldman do not include video streams or portions of video streams.

Furthermore, Aras fails to disclose “overall individual additional information which is associated with the video contents data as a whole, segment individual additional information which is different from said overall individual additional information and is associated with one of a plurality of segments of the video contents data, and scene individual additional information which is different from said overall individual additional information and is different from said segment individual additional information and is associated with one of a plurality of scenes in the one of the plurality of segments of the video contents data.” Aras only discloses audio video identifiers identifying audio video contents (e.g., as depicted in the “ID Number” column in Tables IV-VII), and identifiers of portions of the audio video contents (e.g., as depicted in the “Index” column in Tables IV-VII). These two levels of information do not comprise the three levels of information recited in the claims (e.g., overall information, segment information, and scene information).

For at least the above reasons, the combination of Goldman, Yuen, and Aras does not teach the “second registration means” and “transmission means” recited in claim 1, and would not have rendered claim 1 obvious. Accordingly, the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) should be withdrawn and the claim allowed.

Independent claims 6, 7, 8, and 16, though of different scope from claim 1, also recite, *inter alia*, “overall individual additional information which is associated with the

video contents data as a whole,” “segment individual additional information which is different from said overall individual additional information and is associated with one of a plurality of segments of the video contents data,” and “scene individual additional information which is different from said overall individual additional information and is different from said segment individual additional information and is associated with one of a plurality of scenes in the one of the plurality of segments of the video contents data,” and recite enabling “said video contents data, said general additional information, and said individual additional information to be simultaneously displayed on a display screen.” Therefore, the rejection of claims 6, 7, 8, and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) should be also withdrawn and the claims allowed.

Claims 9-15, 19-22, and 25 depend from one of independent claims 1, 6, 7, or 8. Accordingly, the rejection of claims 9-15, 19-22, and 25 should be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 2, 5, and 17 as allegedly being unpatentable over Goldman in view of Aras, Yuen, and Khoo; claim 18 as allegedly being unpatentable over Goldman, in view of Aras, Yuen, and Herz; and claims 23 and 24 as allegedly being unpatentable over Goldman, in view of Aras, Yuen, and Campbell.

Claims 2, 18, 23, and 24 depend from claim 1 and therefore include all of the recitations of claim 1. As discussed above, a *prima facie* showing of obviousness has not been made in rejecting claim 1 in view of Goldman, Aras, and Yuen. Furthermore, none of Khoo, Herz, or Campbell repair the deficiencies of Goldman, Aras, and Yuen.

As such, Applicant requests that the rejection of claims 2, 18, 23, and 24 be withdrawn, and the claims be allowed.

Independent claim 17 recites, *inter alia*, “overall individual additional information which is associated with the video contents data as a whole,” “segment individual additional information which is different from said overall individual additional information and is associated with one of a plurality of segments of the video contents data,” and “scene individual additional information which is different from said overall individual additional information and is different from said segment individual additional information and is associated with one of a plurality of scenes in the one of the plurality of segments of the video contents data.” As discussed above, none of the cited references, either alone or in combination, disclose or suggest the recited overall additional information. As such, the Office Action fails to establish a *prima facie* showing of obviousness in rejecting claim 17. Claim 5 depends from claim 17. Therefore, the rejection of claims 17 and 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) should be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

In view of the foregoing remarks, the claims are neither anticipated nor rendered obvious in view of the cited references. Applicant therefore requests the Examiner's reconsideration of the application and timely allowance of pending claims 1, 2, and 5-25.

The final Office Action contains characterizations of the claims and the related art with which Applicant does not necessarily agree. Unless expressly noted otherwise, Applicant declines to subscribe to any statement or characterization in the final Office Action.

If a telephone interview will expedite issuance of this application, the Examiner is requested to call Applicant's representative whose name and registration number appear below, at 202-408-4138 to discuss any remaining issues.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this Response and charge any additional required fees to our Deposit Account No. 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,  
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: August 26, 2008

By: Bradley Edelman  
Bradley Edelman  
Reg. No. 57,648